REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is requested. Claims 1-45 are pending with claims 1, 16, and 27 being independent.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because the disclosure lacks a section titled "Brief Summary of the Invention." Applicant respectfully traverses this objection because there is no requirement for a "Brief Summary of the Invention" section in the statute, the Rules, or the MPEP. The applicable statue, §112, paragraph 1, requires only a written description, enablement and the best mode. 37 CFR 1.73 provides that the summary of the invention "*may* include a statement of the object of the invention ... and any object recited should be that of the invention as claimed." Emphasis added. The MPEP says: "The brief summary [of the invention] should be more than a mere statement of the objects of the invention, which statement is also *permissible* under 37 CFR 1.73." §608.01(d); emphasis added. Furthermore, the MPEP says nothing directly but includes a form paragraph (6.01) stating that "The summary [of the invention] *may* point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art." *Id.*; emphasis added. Moreover, the USPTO's *PASAT Authoring Manual*, which provides detailed information and instructions on how to author a specification for electronic filing, confirms that the "Brief Summary of the Invention" section is *not* required.

Claims 1, 16, and 27 describe a method of using a first data processor to manage resources of a second data processor which performs data processing functions that support user applications. The first data processor makes a remote procedure call to the second data processor to invoke on the second data processor a program that supports management of data processing resources of the second data processor. The second data processor executes the program in response to the remote procedure call.

Claims 1-2, 16, 27, 31-33, and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by IBM-Technical Disclosure Bulletin, June 1, 1992, "Remote Procedure Calls For An Attached Processor" (hereinafter TDB). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for at least the reason that TDB does not describe or suggest invoking on the second data processor a program that supports management of data processing resources of the second data processor.

TDB teaches an implementation of remote procedure calls (RPC) for managing communication between a main processor and an attached processor that allows transparent execution of user code on the attached processor. Figure 1 shows User Subroutine 1 calling User Subroutine 2 in the original program that runs entirely on the main processor. Figure 2 shows the same user subroutines, except that User Subroutine 2 is running on the attached processor. Instead of calling User Subroutine 2 directly, User Subroutine 1 calls the RPC stub. The RPC stub runs on the main processor and communicates with the RPC dispatcher that is running on the attached processor. Some communication method, such as named pipes, connects the two processors. After receiving the inputs for User Subroutine 2 from the RPC stub, the RPC dispatcher invokes User Subroutine 2. The RPC dispatcher then writes the outputs of User Subroutine 2 to the RPC stub, which returns the outputs to User Subroutine 1. TDB does not describe or suggest invoking on the second processor a program that supports management of data processing resources of the second data processor. TDB teaches execution of user code on the attached processor and does not describe or suggest execution of a program that supports management of data processing resources of the second data processor. Page 1, lines 13-16 teaches an RPC stub generator that translates an interface specification into subroutines that implement the communication between the processors and invoke the desired subroutine on the attached processor. Lines 13-16 do not describe or suggest execution of a program that supports management of data processing resources of the second data processor. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 16, and 27 are patentable over TDB.

Claims 2-15; 17-26; and 28-45 depend from independent claims 1; 16; and 27, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for claims 2-15, 17-26, and 28-45 for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 16, and 27.

Claims 3-4, 12, 14-15, 19, 26, 37, and 44-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over TDB further in view of Weiser (5,786,819). However, Weiser fails to remedy the failure of TDB to describe or suggest invoking on the second data processor a program that supports management of data processing resources of the second data processor. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-4, 12, 14-15, 19, 26, 37, and 44-45 for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 16, and 27.

3

Weiser also does not describe or suggest the elements of claims 4 and 45. Claims 4 and 45 describe the first data processor downloading a further program to the memory space of the second data processor in conjunction with operation of the first mentioned program. Weiser, in columns 8 and 9, teaches a called procedure executing on device 90 that causes the device to have its memory written, memory read, or memory deleted. Alternatively, the called procedure may establish or reset the definition of a user-defined-function, write text to the display, or generate a sequence of tones from a piezo-speaker. Weiser does not describe or suggest the first data processor downloading a further program to the memory space of the second data processor in conjunction with operation of the first mentioned program. For at least this further reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4 and 45 are patentable over Weiser.

Weiser does not describe or suggest the elements of claim 15. Claim 15 describes making a remote procedure call to the second data processor to invoke on the second data processor a further program and, in response to the remote procedure call, the second data processor executing the further program to download the first-mentioned program into the memory space of the second data processor. Weiser does not describe or suggest invoking on the second data processor a further program and, in response to the remote procedure call, the second data processor executing the further program to download the first-mentioned program into the memory space of the second data processor. For at least this further reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is patentable over Weiser.

Claims 5-6, 20-21, and 38-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over TDB further in view of Engdahl (5,452,420). However, Engdahl fails to remedy the failure of TDB to describe or suggest invoking on the second data processor a program that supports management of data processing resources of the second data processor. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-6, 20-21, and 38-39 for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 16, and 27.

Claims 7, 22, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over TDB further in view of Menezes (5,621,894). However, Menezes fails to remedy the failure of TDB to describe or suggest invoking on the second data processor a program that supports management of data processing resources of the second data processor. Accordingly, Applicant

requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 22, and 41 for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 16, and 27.

Claims 8, 23, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over TDB in view of Engdahl and further in view of Jayakumar (5,904,733). However, Jayakumar fails to remedy the failure of TDB and Engdahl to describe or suggest invoking on the second data processor a program that supports management of data processing resources of the second data processor. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 23, and 40 for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 16, and 27.

Claims 9, 24, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over TDB further in view of Brady (5,724,418). However, Brady fails to remedy the failure of TDB to describe or suggest invoking on the second data processor a program that supports management of data processing resources of the second data processor. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9, 24, and 42 for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 16, and 27.

Claims 10-11, 25, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over TDB further in view of Schreiber (5,787,281). However, Schreiber fails to remedy the failure of TDB to describe or suggest invoking on the second data processor a program that supports management of data processing resources of the second data processor. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-11, 25 and 43 for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 16, and 27.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over TDB further in view of Nozue (5,890,189). However, Nozue fails to remedy the failure of TDB to describe or suggest invoking on the second data processor a program that supports management of data processing resources of the second data processor. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 16, and 27.

Claims 17, 18, and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over TDB further in view of Sitrick (5,728,960). However, Sitrick fails to remedy the failure of TDB to describe or suggest invoking on the second data processor a program that supports management of data processing resources of the second data processor. Accordingly, Applicant requests

reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17, 18, and 28-30 for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 16, and 27.

In view of these remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Respectfully submitted,

Indranil Chowdhury
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 47,490

W. James Brady, III
Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX   75265
(972) 917-4371

6